



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,710	07/27/2005	Kamel Khalili	06056-0309US1	4632

23973 7590 08/17/2007
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH
ATTN: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP
ONE LOGAN SQUARE
18TH AND CHERRY STREETS
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-6996

EXAMINER

HUFF, SHEELA JITENDRA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1643

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/17/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/517,710

Applicant(s)

KHALILI, KAMEL

Examiner

Sheela J. Huff

Art Unit

1643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 December 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/31/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Applicant's have priority to 60/388019, filed 6/12/02.

Information Disclosure Statement

The IDS filed 1/31/05 has been considered and an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 is enclosed.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Applicant is directed to page 18, line 18 and page 19, line 13 of the specification.

Claim Objections

Claims 7 and 21 are objected to because of the following informalities: The sequence needs to have a SEQ ID NO. next to it.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-5, 8, 12-19, 22 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Part A

Applicant defines the term agnoproteins as having at least 50% identity to SEQ ID NO. 1 (see page 5, lines 12-25 of the specification). The claims are drawn to the use of agnoproteins to inhibit cell growth or to treat a person having cancer or not having cancer. While the amino acid sequences of SEQ ID NO:1, 3-7, 13-15, 17 and 22 are adequately described in the specification as-filed, thereby providing an adequate basis for said sequences; there is insufficient written description as to the identity of a polypeptide having at least 50-99% sequence identity to SEQ ID NO:1 that would still maintain the function of the polypeptide. Consequently, the specification does not provide an adequate written description of a polypeptide having at least 50-99% sequence identity to SEQ ID NO:1.

The specification as filed does not provide adequate written description support for a polypeptide having at least 50-99% sequence identity to SEQ ID NO:1.

Polypeptides having diverse functions are encompassed by the phrase 50-99%

Art Unit: 1643

identity. Thus a broad genus having potentially highly diverse functions is encompassed by the phrase 50-99% sequence identity and conception cannot be achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method. For example, Skolnick et al. (Trends in Biotech., 18(1):34-39, 2000) teach that the skilled artisan is well aware that assigning functional activities for any particular protein or protein family based upon sequence homology is inaccurate, in part because of the multifunctional nature of proteins (e.g., Abstract and Sequence-based approaches to function prediction, page 34). Even in situations where there is some confidence of a similar overall structure between two proteins, only experimental research can confirm the artisan's best guess as to the function of the structurally related protein (see in particular Abstract and Box 2). Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention. The sequence itself is required. See Fiers v. Revel, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd., 18 USPQ2d 1016.

Therefore, only SEQ ID No. 1, 3-7, 13-15, 17 and 22 meet the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the written description inquiry, whatever is now claimed. (See page 1117.) The specification does not clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed. (See Vas-Cath at

page 1116.). Consequently, Applicant was not in possession of the instant claimed invention. See University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co. 43 USPQ2d 1398.

Part B

There is insufficient written description encompassing the broad genus of agnoproteins, fragments or derivatives of agnoproteins because the relevant identifying characteristics such as structure of other physical and/or chemical characteristics of the agnoproteins, are not set forth in the specification as filed, commensurate in scope with the claimed invention.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession *of the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*." (See page 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See Vas-Cath at page 1116. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. See Fiers v. Revel, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd., 18 USPQ2d 1016.

One cannot describe what one has not conceived. See Fiddes v. Baird, 30 USPQ2d 1481, 1483. In Fiddes v. Baird, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found unpatentable due to lack of written description for the broad class. The

Art Unit: 1643

specification provided only the bovine sequence. Thus, the specification fails to describe these DNA sequences. The Court further elaborated that generic statements are not an adequate written description of the genus because it does not distinguish the claimed genus from others, except by function. Finally, the Court indicated that while applicants are not required to disclose every species encompassed within a genus, the description of a genus is achieved by the recitation of a representative number of DNA molecules, defined by nucleotide sequence, falling within the scope of the genus, See The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly and Company, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

The instant specification only discloses agnoproteins of SEQ ID NO. 1, 3-7, 13-15, 17 and 22.

Applicant is relying upon certain biological activities and the disclosure of this limited representative number of species to support an entire genus. The instant invention encompasses the broad genus of agnoproteins, fragments and derivatives thereof yet the instant specification does not provide sufficient written description as to the structural features of said agnoproteins as are currently encompassed by the claims. Also, the specification does not provide for the correlation between the chemical structure and the function of the genus of agnoproteins/fragments/derivatives, currently encompassed by the claimed invention. The reliance on the disclosed limited examples of SEQ ID NO. 1, 3-7, 13-15, 17 and 22 indicated above and disclosed in the specification as filed does not support the written description of any agnoprotein/fragment/derivative thereof. It has been well known that minor structural

Art Unit: 1643

differences even among structurally related compounds or compositions can result in substantially different biology, expression and activities. The specification as filed does not provide written description for the genus of agnoproteins/fragments/derivatives indicated above and disclosed in the specification as filed and encompassed by the claimed invention.

A person of skill in the art would not know which sequences are essential, which sequences are non-essential, and what particular sequence lengths identify essential sequences for identifying a genus of agnoproteins/fragments/derivatives structurally unrelated to SEQ ID NO. 1, 3-7, 13-15, 17 and 22 indicated above and disclosed in the specification as filed.

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 USC 112, first paragraph, have been described in *In Re Colianni*, 195 USPQ 150 (CCPA 1977) and have been adopted by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex Parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BPAI 1986). Among these factors are:

1. the nature of the invention,

2. the state of the prior art,
3. the predictability or lack thereof in the art,
4. the breath of the claims,
5. the amount of direction or guidance present, and
6. the presence or absence of working examples.

The following is an analysis of these factors in relationship to this application.

Applicant discloses and claims methods of inhibiting cell growth and methods of treating subjects having or not having cancer. Claims 26 and 27 are included in this rejection because they are directed to pharmaceutical compositions and this reads on *in vivo* use.

While the state of the art does recognize JCV, BK and SV40 agnoproteins, none of these proteins have been used *in vivo* to treat or inhibit any disease.

The support of the claimed invention applicant provides *in vitro* data using CMV-agnoprotein, YFP-agnoprotein and GFP-agnoprotein in tumor cells lines. These data show the expression of tumor suppressor proteins in NIH-3T3 cells. There is no objective evidence to show that this assay is correlatable to *in vivo* use or to the inhibition of cell growth or to the treatment of subjects having cancer or other cell proliferative diseases. Applicant's have not provided any *in vivo* data to overcome this lack of correlation.

One cannot extrapolate the teaching of the specification to the claimed invention because the *in vitro* experimental data presented is clearly not drawn to subjects with tumor cells. Freshney (Culture of Animal Cells, A Manual of Basic Technique, Alan R. Liss, Inc., 1983, New York, p4) teach that it is recognized in the art that there are many differences between cultured cells and their counterparts *in vivo*. These differences stem from the dissociation of cells from a three-dimensional geometry and their

propagation on a two-dimensional substrate. Specific cell interactions characteristic of histology of the tissue are lost. The culture environment lacks the input of the nervous and endocrine systems involved in homeostatic regulation *in vivo*. Without this control, cellular metabolism may be more constant *in vitro* but may not be truly representative of the tissue from which the cells were derived. This has often led to tissue culture being regarded in a rather skeptical light (p. 4, see Major Differences *In Vitro*). Further, Dermer (Bio/Technology, 1994, 12:320) teaches that, "petri dish cancer" is a poor representation of malignancy, with characteristics profoundly different from the human disease. Further, Dermer teaches that when a normal or malignant body cell adapts to immortal life in culture, it takes an evolutionary -type step that enables the new line to thrive in its artificial environment. This step transforms a cell from one that is stable and differentiated to one that is not, yet normal or malignant cells *in vivo* are not like that. The reference states that evidence of the contradictions between life on the bottom of a lab dish and in the body has been in the scientific literature for more than 30 years. Clearly it is well known in the art that cells in culture exhibit characteristics different from those *in vivo* and cannot duplicate the complex conditions of the *in vivo* environment involved in host-tumor and cell-cell interactions.

Further, one cannot extrapolate the teaching of the specification to the claims because it is well known that the art of anticancer drug discovery for cancer therapy is highly unpredictable, for example, Gura (Science, 1997, 278:1041-1042) teaches that researchers face the problem of sifting through potential anticancer agents to find ones promising enough to make human clinical trials worthwhile and teach that since formal screening began in 1955, many thousands of drugs have shown activity in either cell or animal models but that only 39 have actually been shown to be useful for chemotherapy (p. 1041, see first and second para). Because of the known unpredictability of the art, in

the absence of experimental evidence, no one skilled in the art would accept the assertion that the claimed methods could be used for just any cancer and this is underscored by Jain (Sci. Am., 1994, 271:58-65) who teaches that tumors resist penetration by drugs (p.58, col 1) and that scientists need to put expanded effort into uncovering the reasons why therapeutic agents that show encouraging promise in the laboratory often turn out to be ineffective in the treatment of common solid tumors (p. 65, col 3) and that not all tumors behave the same and can be treated with the same drugs.

Thus, it is clear that the data provided in the specification cannot be readily extrapolated to in vivo use to treat cancers. Extrapolating this argument even further, one skilled in the art would also be hard pressed to correlate an in vitro study in tumor cells to in vivo use to treat subjects without cancer because the etiology of the diseases are completely different.

Furthermore, applicant is claiming very broadly. Applicant is claiming fragments and derivatives of agnoproteins. As stated on page 6 of the specification, derivatives includes substitutions, deletions and additions. The scope of the claims is not commensurate with the enablement provided by the disclosure with regard to the extremely large number of proteins broadly encompassed by the claims and the claims broadly encompass a significant number of inoperative species. Since the amino acid sequence of a protein determines its structural and functional properties, predictability of which changes can be tolerated in a protein's amino acid sequence and still retain similar biological activity requires a (1) knowledge of and guidance with regard to which amino acids in the protein's sequence, if any, are tolerant of modification and which are conserved (i.e., expectantly intolerant to modification), and (2) detailed knowledge of the ways in which the protein's structure relates to its function. However, the problem of

Art Unit: 1643

predicting protein structure from mere sequence data of a single protein and in turn utilizing predicted structural determinations to ascertain functional aspects of the protein and finally what changes can be tolerated with respect thereto is extremely complex and well outside the realm of routine experimentation.

While recombinant and mutagenesis techniques are known, it is not routine in the art to screen for multiple substitutions or multiple modifications of other types and the positions within the protein's sequence where amino acid modifications can be made with a reasonable expectation of success in obtaining similar biological activity are limited in any protein. The result of such modifications is unpredictable based on the instant disclosure. One skilled in the art would expect any tolerance to modification shown for a given protein to diminish with each further and additional modification, e.g., multiple substitutions. The sequence of some proteins is highly conserved and one skilled in the art would not expect tolerance to any amino acids modifications in such proteins.

The specification does not support the broad scope of the claims which encompass all modifications and fragments because the specification does not disclose the following:

1. The amino acid sequence for the claimed protein;
2. The general tolerance to modification and extent of such tolerance;
3. The specific positions and regions of the sequence(s) which can be predictably modified and which regions are critical;
4. What fragments, if any, can be made which retain the biological activity of the intact protein; and

5. The specification provides insufficient guidance as to which of the essentially infinite possible choices is likely to be successful.

Thus, applicants have not provided sufficient guidance to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the claimed protein in manner reasonable correlated with the scope of the claims broadly including any number of additions, deletions, or substitutions and fragments of any size. The scope of the claims must bear a reasonable correlation with the scope of enablement. See *In re Fisher*, 166 USPQ 19 24 (CCPA 1970). Without such guidance, the changes which can be made in the protein's structure and still maintain biological activity is unpredictable and the experimentation left to those skilled in the art is unnecessarily and improperly extensive and undue. See *Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 927 F.2d 1200, 18 USPQ 1016 (Fed. Cir. 1991) at 18 USPQ 1026 1027 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BPAI 1986).

In view of the above, it is the Examiner's position that one skilled in the art could not make and/or use the invention without undue experimentation.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 USC 112, first paragraph, have been described in *In Re Colianni*, 195 USPQ 150 (CCPA 1977) and have been adopted by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex Parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BPAI 1986). Among these factors are:

1. the nature of the invention,
2. the state of the prior art,
3. the predictability or lack thereof in the art,
4. the breadth of the claims,
5. the amount of direction or guidance present, and
6. the presence or absence of working examples.

The following is an analysis of these factors in relationship to this application.

Applicant claims and discloses a pharmaceutical composition comprising a nucleic acid sequence encoding agnoproteins and fragments and derivatives thereof. The intended use for these is to inhibit cell growth or treat subjects with cancer or subjects not having cancer. Since the nucleic acid sequence must be delivered in an expression vector the claims read on gene therapy.

The art of gene therapy, i.e., the *in vivo* delivery genetic information to targeted cells within a body using naked DNA or viral vectors or by reintroducing *ex vivo* modified host cells into the body, is still in its infancy. Moreover, the art is highly unpredictable and its successful application has been hindered by numerous limitations, which the specification does not remedy and would preclude the skilled artisan from having a reasonable expectation of successfully making and using the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

For example, the teachings of the specification have not overcome the problems with *in vivo* delivery and expression. Verma et al. (*Nature* 1997, **389**: 239-242) teaches that the Achilles heel of gene therapy is gene delivery (page 239, column 3). Verma et al. states that the ongoing problem is the inability to deliver genes efficiently and to obtain sustained expression; see entire document (e.g., page 239, column 3). Similarly, Amalfitano et al. (*Current Gene Therapy* 2002, **2**: 111-133) teaches that non-viral mediated transfer of DNA generally suffers from low transduction efficiencies; see entire document (e.g., page 111, column 2). In addition, Amalfitano et al. discusses numerous limitations that have been encountered in using retroviral vectors to deliver DNA into a subject and teaches the use of adenoviral vectors can be ineffective because of the induction of strong immune responses in the host to the viral vectors and direct acute and chronic toxicity caused by the vector itself; see entire document (e.g., abstract).

It is noted that Amalfitano et al. teaches that despite general lack of success, the first conclusive evidence that gene therapy can show efficacy in humans was achieved in human X-linked SCID subjects *via* retrovirus transduction (page 111, column 2). However, since the publication, The Department of Health and Human Services has released a memorandum dated January 14, 2003, a copy of which is attached to this Office action, that urges all such investigations to be discontinued until new data are available, the possible etiology and risks of adverse events associated are considered, and recommendations emerge. Despite the initial promise of the trial studying gene transfer as a possible treatment for the disease, investigators have found that retroviral-mediated insertion of the transgene has caused the subjects to develop cancer. The results of the trial underscore the high degree of unpredictability associated with the art and the fact that the skilled artisan could not make or use the claimed invention without undue and/or unreasonable experimentation.

The state of the art, as a whole, is well defined by Pandha et al. (*Current Opinion in Investigational Drugs* 2000; **1** (1): 122-134). Pandha et al. teaches:

Despite the rapid technological advances that continue to sustain the field of cancer gene therapy, few individual patients have benefited from the revolution so far. The plethora of clinical trials described confirms that each malignancy will have its own ideal strategy based on the associated molecular defects, and there has been rapid progress from this viewpoint. At the same time, there

Art Unit: 1643

has been a renewed appreciation for the limitations to gene therapy, which include low efficiency of gene transfer, poor specificity of response and methods to accurately evaluate responses, and lack of truly tumor-specific targets at which to aim. As with all new therapies, we are climbing a steep learning curve in terms of encountering treatment-related toxicities, as well as profound ethical and regulatory issues (abstract).

In conclusion, upon careful consideration of the factors used to determine whether undue experimentation is required, in accordance with the Federal Circuit decision of *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988), the amount of guidance, direction, and exemplification disclosed in the specification, as filed, is not deemed sufficient to have enable the skilled artisan to use the claimed invention at the time the application was filed without undue and/or unreasonable experimentation.

Claims 11-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. In claims 11 and 25 it is not clear if the derivative is SEQ Id NO. 22 or if the derivative is a derivatized form of SEQ Id NO. 22.

b. In claims 12 and 18, the term "deriving" renders the claims vague and indefinite. Does this mean that the cells are derivatized? If so with what?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Del Valle et al, Journal of the national Cancer Insititue Vol. 94 p. 267 (2/2002).

This reference discloses fragments and derivatives of JCV agnoproteins (see p. 268 top of first column). These fragments and derivatives were made recombinantly, thus using a nucleic acid sequence. Since the nucleic acid sequence was used to express the fragments and derivatives, it is in a composition. Since the proteins were used to make antibodies, these are also in a composition.

Because the term "pharmaceutical" is intended use, it does not carry any patentable weight.

Claims 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Resnick et al Journal of Virology vol. 60 p. 1098 (1986).

This reference discloses SV40 agnoprotein as a 61 amino acid sequence that is coded from late mRNA (see first column, second paragraph of p. 1098 and also the abstract). Since these were used in in vitro cell assays (see Fig 9+), they are in a composition.

Because the term "pharmaceutical" is intended use, it does not carry any patentable weight.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Frisque et al J. Virology vol. 51 p. 458 (1984).

Art Unit: 1643

This reference discloses JCV genome. This genome comprises agnoprotein (see Figure 1 for nucleic acid). It is inherent that these are in a composition because they were obtained from glial cells.

Because the term "pharmaceutical" is intended use, it does not carry any patentable weight.

Claims 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jay et al Nature vol. 291 p. 346 (1981).

This reference discloses the expression of SV40 agnoprotein and fragments thereof (Fig. 2-5). It is inherent that the expression requires the nucleic acid sequence and that it is in a composition. Since the agnogene product is analyzed in culture assays, it is also in a composition.

Because the term "pharmaceutical" is intended use, it does not carry any patentable weight.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sheela J. Huff whose telephone number is 571-272-0834. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday and Thursday from 5:30am to 1:30pm.

Art Unit: 1643

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Helms can be reached on 571-272-0832. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Sheela J Huff
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1643

sjh